

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Application No. 09/650,273
Amendment dated January 3, 2006
After Final Office Action of November 2, 2005

Docket No.: 08226/1203352-US1

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are currently pending. A Final Office Action mailed on November 2, 2005, found Claims 1-27 in condition for allowance, and rejected Claims 28-44 as obvious in view of several prior art references.

The present response has amended independent Claims 28, 32, 35, and 40. No new matter was added by any of these amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 28-34 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas (US 2001/0034743). The instant Office Action indicated that a previous rejection of Claims 28-34 mailed on March 25, 2005, was hereby incorporated by reference. Also, the Office Action noted that Thomas teaches translating and compiling new codes at the server side as well as the client side or anywhere in between.

Claim 28 has been amended to further clarify a previously claimed aspect of the invention, namely, the modification of a code segment that is provided by a proxy server to a client device and the subsequent use of the modified code segment causing a second request identifying information stored at a remote source to be sent to the proxy server that requests the identified information from the remote source for the client device. Clearly, neither singly nor in combination, does Thomas or any other cited reference teach this element of the claimed invention.

Additionally, Thomas discloses replacing Web site URLs with tokens so that the Web site and its referenced content is portable to a more proximate location. (Abstract). In contrast, amended Claim 28 teaches parsing codes segments into tokens to determine relationships that are used to modify the code segments and maintain subsequent compatibility with a run time library. As now amended, Claim 28 teaches using the relationships between the tokens to modify a code segment, not the tokens themselves as modifying elements. Thus, for at least the reasons presented above, amended Claim 28 is not obvious in view of Thomas. Furthermore, since Claims 29-34

{S:\082226\1203352-us\1\80047710.DOC |XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX} 12

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Application No. 09/650,273
Amendment dated January 3, 2006
After Final Office Action of November 2, 2005

Docket No.: 08226/1203352-US1

depend on amended independent Claim 28, these dependent claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 35-44 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delph (US 6,286,029) in view of Wu (US 5,987,256).

In regard to Claim 35, the Office Action found that Delph makes most elements of independent Claim 35 obvious. However, it did find that the claimed modification of the code to be compatible with the host run time library was not obvious in view of the Delph reference. Instead, the Office Action noted that Wu discloses modifying web pages to be compatible with a run time library system on a thin client. Thus, the Office Action found that Delph in combination with Wu taught each element of Claim 35.

Amended Claim 35 now teaches that the compatibility of the modified code segment with the runtime library is determined through tokenization of relationships for the modified code segment. Nowhere in the Wu reference is this inventive aspect of the invention either suggested or taught. Instead, the cited reference discloses generating HTML code for a rendered display based on a class hierarchy. (Column 6, lines 1-7). Therefore, the suggested combination of Delph and Wu does not make amended Claim 35 obvious. Furthermore, since amended Claim 40 is somewhat similar to amended claim 35 albeit different, amended Claim 40 is also allowable for substantially the same reasons as amended Claim 35. Additionally, since Claims 36-39 and 41-44 depend on amended independent Claims 35 and 40, respectively, these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims.

{S:\08226\1203352-us1\80047710.DOC 00000000000000000000000000000000 } 13

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Application No. 09/650,273
Amendment dated January 3, 2006
After Final Office Action of November 2, 2005

Docket No.: 08226/1203352-US1

CONCLUSION

By the foregoing explanations, Applicants believe that this response has addressed fully all of the concerns expressed in the Final Office Action, and believes that it has placed each of the pending claims in condition for immediate allowance. Should any further aspects of the application remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Dated: January 3, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

John W. Branch

Registration No.: 41,633

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(206) 262-8900

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

{S:\08226\1203352-us1\80047710.DOC (1203352) 14